## Indigeneity K 13-14

This K was written for the Jan-Feb 2014 topic (environmental protection) – it criticized affs like Buen Vivir that glorified indigenous people and their culture as an ideal we should model because they are supposedly more connected to the environment.

### Super Short 1NC

#### The idea of the indigenous people as “protectors of the environment” is essentialist and paints indigenous people as “primitive” – this representations of indigenous people as having a pre-development way of life symbolically affirms the West as superior and reinforces colonialism

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

The postcolonial subject is one which has frequently been represented in relation to Western imperialist discourse, benefitting and reinforcing prevailing dominant power structures. (Moreira- Slepoy: 11) Postcolonial dynamics are characterised by underlying power distributions between the coloniser and colonised, where the former exerts his power and authority over the colonized. Interferences with what were generally indigenous cultures have been conducted in the name of development, out of good will to help the colonized achieve similar “civilized” ways as the colonizer himself. This civilizing process was achieved in part through the use of representation as a means of control by spreading Western Imperialist discourse through essentialist views. In philosophy, the essential properties of an object, in contrast to accidental properties, are qualities which are necessary to an object’s being, and without which it could not possibly ‘be’. They are thus essential to its existence. Accidental properties, however, refer to certain qualities which an object might possess, but might also not have possessed (Robertson). In relation to this, one might have an essentialist view on culture. This leads one to understanding cultural ways as natural (common knowledge), not recognizing social construct, which presents a danger when one tries to impose these ‘truths’ on a culture presenting differing ways of life. We will investigate the impact of stereotypes on a population, and its use as an effective medium of coercion. During imperialist times, European colonial power was not solely maintained through military means. In fact, representations of the colonial subject were used as a tool in promoting their discourse. (MOREIRA-SLEPOY: 2) The images circulating depicting the colonized were controlled and manipulated which was a powerful tool of coercion. According to Said, “...we live in a world not only of commodities but also of representations, and representations-their production, circulation, history, and interpretation are the very element of culture-” (MOREIRA-SLEPOY: 1) These representations have represented the colonized as a deviant Other, bringing him to a fixed and static position. For Homi Bhabha, fixity is: “...the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, which is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition” (IBID). Thus, this fixity is a strategy used by essentialist dominating powers to enforce their ways over the colonies through representation whilst ensuring a continuation of their discourse. The ensuring of one’s power through representation will be developed later in the chapter. In terms of the colonized responses to the representations, Dubois has proposed what she refers to as double consciousness, which is: “...a peculiar sensation, [...] this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness” (Du Bois: 3-4). What Dubois is claiming here is that when being oppressed, the colonised starts to look at themselves through the eyes of the colonisers, internalising the stereotyped constructions of their identity which leads to a mimicking of the colonizer’s ways. However, while the colonised feel an urge to comply with the dominant discourse, they also intuitively feel the need to find alternative ways of resisting. The postcolonial subject will unconsciously try to gain acceptance by internalizing the dominant essential discourses, thereby mimicking the representations viewed. In Homi Bhabha’s words, this mimicry may be understood as “one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge”. He adds that this strategy aims at creating «a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.” This implies that the colonized should internalise and embody Western discourse, while however still remaining an Other. These ideological representations were, naturally, derogative, portraying the colonized as a degenerate or primitive being (Bhabha: 85-86). In terms of aesthetics, Western works were considered as surpassing any other forms of art. These were left unquestioned, considered as universal truths. In fact, Schwarz states that: “...a conception of art which views itself as transcending ideology even as it raises a single object, English literature, to the status of self- contained totality” to point to the essentialist views of the prior (Schwarz: 21). Binary thought is characteristic of imperialist discourse, and can be seen when a representation is made through divisions of Self/Other. This Othering can also be done through the representing of Others as a mythical or exotic creature. Edward Said has contributed greatly to this process which he terms Orientalisation: “The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences” (Said: 87). Thus, the Occident/Orient dichotomy is a socially constructed one which has a history and tradition. These mechanisms of representation established through degradation or exoticism are employed to symbolically force subjects into internalizing dominant discourses, entering the collective consciousness of the people, thus reinforcing governing power relations. This is obviously an essentialist stance where one does not question essentially natural and habitual ways of life, enforcing them on others who ‘do not know better’. Through this binary way of perceiving, a hierarchical view where the self is perceived as superior to the Other is established. The self is also the ‘normal’ one, and in this sense, the Other is a sort of alien. In this section, we will make a brief historical overview of the west ́s hegemonic power over the Native Americans. The image we have of the Native Americans today is a simplified western construction which is not adequate with the complexity of Native American culture, history and their self-representations. (Harlan et al: 202) This demonstrates the way power can be used to enforce dominant ideologies. In Robert Berkhoffer's The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present he writes that: “Since Whites primarily understood the Indian as an antithesis to themselves, then civilization and Indianness as they defined them would forever be opposites.” (Robert Berkhofer, Jr., The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present, New York: First Vintage Books Edition, A Division of Random House, 1979, p. 29) Indians exist not as having their holistic culture and history but as a dichotomy to us, and therefore dependent on us. If the Indian exists only in relation to being what 'white is not', then the Indian is truly Indian if he remains excluded from civilization and maintains his traditional culture. He is therefore an ahistorical and decontextualized being. When American anthropology developed in the 1890's, artifact collecting became popular amongst intellectuals. Later, in the twentieth century, tourism expanded and the general public started collecting artifacts. According to Brody and Garmhausen, it is between 1900 and 1917 that white intervention amongst Native art began in the Southwest (Harlan et al: 217). Anthropologists or Indian traders went to various Indian tribes and provided the Natives with material for painting. They were asked to make paintings regarding tribal ceremonies. These paintings were bought and exhibited at museums or used for research. These paintings are therefore not 'authentic' in relation to the western definition of authentic which is not influenced by Western culture. They are paintings seeking to please the white market. By the 1920's, there were over a dozen of Indians who produced these 'Native paintings' for white customers in areas such as in Santa Fe, Taos and New Mexico. Two of these became a market which remains the largest 'Indian art' venues today (Gallup Inter Tribal Indian Ceremonial and Santa Fe Indian Market) (IBID). A larger event was held in 1931 in New York. This National Indian Art show emphasized that Indians were a dying race and that their culture needed preserving. As the demand for Native art increased, more Indians participated in the making of this art (IBID). From the 1930's onwards, art was seen as a process for economic growth. For this reason, art, which assured the continuation of 'Native art' was incorporated into boarding schools as part of the curriculum (Harlan et al: 216). The Santa Fe boarding school is an example of this. The teachers were non Native American and taught Native American students to use techniques and subjects which conformed to the idea of the Vanishing Indian. This school aimed to preserve Indian art through techniques which were said to be ‘authentic’. Dorothy Dunn, the director of the Santa Fe art school decided that the art produced was to be sold exclusively for the Indian Market. This way of making art was known as the Studio style. The students were told to look in their backgrounds for tribal themes to depict and were refused any other topic. The subjects were traditional ceremonial and tribal scenes, and plants and animals, using a flat, decorative, linear style. (Ojibwa) It is important to note that although Dorothy Dunn scholarized the studio style to fit the demands of the white market, several techniques were already present in Native American culture before the arrival of settlers. For example, she introduced the use of earth color paintings in 1933 to reproduce the colors traditionally used in painting pottery and ceremonial objects. (Ojibwa) example of a studio-style painting, by Joe Herrera, Cochiti “Men’s arrow Dance” 1938 In 1959, The Rockefeller conference took place at the university of Arizona. The aim of this conference was to discuss ways to preserve and expand Southwest Indian art. Dorothy Dunn supported the idea that Indian studio style art was ahistorical:.”Indian painting is, first of all, art, but in the greater implications of human relationships and history it is something more—something perhaps of a genetic aspect in the riddle of mankind. Unless the legends, songs, ceremonies, and other native customs are recorded by the people themselves, painting must continue to be the principal contributor of Indian thought to the world art and history.” (Harlan et al: 219) Dorothy Dunn is placing the Indians beyond history and context thus bringing them to a more universal and mystical level of mankind. Lloyd New went against the ideas held by the conference concerning the idea of the vanishing Indian: ”Let’s admit, sadly if you must, that the hey-dey of Indian life is past, or passing. Let’s also admit that art with all peoples has been a manifestation of the lives of those people, reflecting the truth of the times. And if Indian culture is in a state of flux then we must expect a corresponding art” (IBID). In the late fifties and early sixties, there was a shift in Indian Art. Until then, it had only been outsiders who spoke on behalf of Native American culture. This started changing slowly. In October 1959, workshops were organized by organizers of the University of Arizona for young Indian artists. It was in order to help the younger generation during a time of conflict between traditional and contemporary viewpoints. The workshops did not only focus on Indian painting as seen in the Studio Art movement. They learned from both Indian anthropological resources and historic and contemporary Western art sources and were taught by both Indian and Anglo instructors (IBID). In 1962, the Santa Fe boarding school was replaced by the Institute of American Indian Arts (also known as IAIA). Three Native American instructors were hired as instructors of the school. They broadened the fields of Native Arts so it did not only encompass painting. This period was known as the post-studio style and golden period. American Indian studies later became available at universities which caused competition for the IAIA. Modern artists began detaching themselves from the techniques of the industry and developed their own techniques. The art produced was for a larger audience, in opposition to the Studio Style. New artists became renowned for being artists and not only Native Artists. Furthermore, by the mid- 2000s a new generation of artists started to create socially critical works (Harlan et al: 221). Museums have broadened the boundaries of Indian Arts so that they are in accordance with modernity (and not only the 'authentic' Indian image from the Indian Market.) This is the case of the exhibition New maternities in a post Indian world at the National Museum of the American Indian (IBID). This museum collaborates with Native communities and gives place to the voices of contemporary Indigenous as exhibitions are from the Native perspective. Theory of Representation of Stereotypes Stereotyping is defined as a ”one-sided characterization of others, and as a general process, stereotyping is a unilinear mode of representing them.” (Pickering: 47). The two stereotypes which are relevant in relation to the case of Native American representation are the concepts of the 'Other' and the 'primitive', which is derived from the former. As shall be investigated further in the project, Native Americans have been subjected to various stereotypes. Stereotypes are strong tools of representation as they allow symbolic control over the one who is stereotyped. As we have seen in the previous chapter, stereotypes are maintained by those in power. They have the ability to “reduce everything about the person to those traits, exaggerate and simplify them, and fix them without change or development to eternity” (Hall, 1997: 258). As a symbolic process it is effective, as people can take it as being true. Firstly, we shall attempt to explain that due to its naturalized appearance the stereotype can be efficient and thus create a symbolic control over the other. Secondly, we shall establish the various ways in which it maintains symbolic control. These manifest themselves partly through symbolic expulsion of the ‘Other’. The control over space and time is an important aspect here. This is primarily the case in the stereotyping of the primitive. We shall see that control over time and space leads to a denial of history. Stereotyping involves a process of objectification of the ‘Other’, which leaves the other in a position where his cultural identity will be damaged with no possibility for change. Stereotypes are able to have an effect on both those stereotyping and those being stereotyped. It is for this reason that we can speak of a symbolic control. It is not the stereotype in itself which is powerful, but the legitimacy that people grant it. When people start taking it as being true and act in accordance to it, the power of the stereotype takes place. As we have formerly observed, power relations play a role on representations. This is in relation to the hegemonic relations and structures within a society(ies). Bourdieu states that: “The cultural arbitrary is used by dominant groups or classes because it expresses completely although always in a mediated way the objective and material interests of the dominant group” (Rajan: 139). This means that representations can appear to us as natural, as they reflect underlying power relations. Indeed, due to the power relations at play, what is culturally arbitrary takes on a quasi- cognitive dimension, as if they could be demonstrated objectively or separately from culture (Pickering :70). If stereotypes take on a naturalized form, then they can hardly change. The association with essentialism is clear here. Cultural values take on naturalized dimensions and appear to have an innate and universal existence rather than taken as being cultural constructs (Merriam-Webster). Therefore, the stereotype appears to us as 'true' and ‘transparent'. The stereotype then reaches a neutral level and is disguised. It needs to be masked in order to exercise its power (Pickering: 70). The construction of the ‘Other’ can be explained in relation to power relations. In relation to hegemony, those who possess the power have the ability to regulate the norms of society in their interest. In order to maintain their position, they ensure the exclusion of those who do not possess power. (Hugh). Those who do not fit into society’s norms are deviants. They do not go unnoticed. For “what is taken as normal is usually taken for granted and left unquestioned” (Pickering: 70). The opposite also applies that what is not normal or deviant is noticed. In The Second Sex, de Beauvoir illustrates this in relation to gender: “He is the Subject, he is the Absolute - she is the ‘Other’” (Pickering: 64). This could be applied to other social categories such as race, ethnicity etc. Those who possess the power possess the means to construct the discourses. They define themselves in contrast to the ‘Others’. The ‘Others’ do not have the means of defining themselves, but instead identify themselves through the dominant groups’ self-definition. This is a denial of identity as it “...divests them of their social and cultural identities by diminishing them to their stereotyped definitions.” (Pickering: 73). Furthermore, this recognition of oneself as ‘Other’ violates individual autonomy and independence as the subject is objectified as complementary to another subject in order to be. Stereotyping can thereafter cast the 'Other' on the social periphery. By distancing the 'Other', it unifies the sense of social identity of the ones placed at the symbolic center. The need for this symbolic centrality suggests two causes: ”...either a fear of what cannot be admitted into an ordered identity, or a critical lack, an absence in the presence of identity which demands that the other be turned into an object of happy assimilation” (Pickering: 49) It can be said that the 'Other' is accomplishing the needs of solving fantasies of those engaged in the process of stereotyping. In this way, stereotypes reveal more about the ones stereotyping than the one being stereotyped: “The Other is always constructed as an object for the benefit of the subject who stands in a need of an objectified other in order to achieve a masterly self-definition” (Pickering: 71) Defining the Other is first and foremost to define the self. In order to understand the construction of the stereotype of the primitive, it is necessary to look back into history to when the term was first used, as the view on the primitive today is still based on this imperial history (Pickering: 52). The term primitive is the binary opposite of the term modernity. The notion of the 'primitive' became widely used in the nineteenth century (though it had existed since the Columbian times (Pickering: 51). As the concept of the 'Other', the primitive fulfilled the task of mirroring the West, more particularly in their own development. The primitive is seen as antithesis to development. Darwin's evolutionism was an important contribution to the transition from the traditional to the modern society (Pickering: 52). This led to an interest in studying 'primitive' societies, which lacked any sense of development concerning empirical and rational knowledge. The primitive was therefore the opposite of the civilized modern individual. Founded on evolutionism was the eugenics movement, initiated by Francis Galton who justified superiority of races by stating that physically inherent characteristics had bred Europeans into modern civilized beings (Pickering: 53). The dominion of Europeans over other less scientifically developed cultures was confirmed and the existence of races confirmed. The construction of races carries many consequences. Along with it is the idea that the 'primitive' cultures lack the innate abilities to develop, which Europeans have. This legitimizes Europeans' right to control these cultures, in order to develop them. It also puts the West at the symbolic center and every other culture on the margin due to being modern and therefore superior. We can note that due to the fact that the primitives serve as a mirror for Western development, Darwin's theory of Evolution brought a hierarchical model within social development where development was the dynamic of evolution (with the West at one end and the primitive cultures at the other). According to this thought, every culture goes through the same stages in relation to this scale of progress, following the path of Europe. This brings every culture as dependent to the West on an inferior level, as they will all follow the same stages of development the West has undergone. The Other serves to indicate how far Western civilization has developed. The West is therefore the reference point to other cultures as it is the most developed. These cultures serve the purpose of a ”living fossil” for the West, as a mirror of the stage that Europe had gone through long ago. They are in fact so underdeveloped that they represent a form of human existence which is”...backward, unchanging, simple form of human existence which the West had long left behind” (Pickering: 54). As the primitive is placed into the past of the West, it creates a division in time around the globe where different cultures are living in different times. Living in the past does not leave space for them to change their position on a symbolic level. We can notice a temporalization of geographical spaces. As mentioned above, temporality is divided in stages regarding the Western model of modernity. The primitive is so underdeveloped that he does not have a place on the scale. Consequently, he is denied time. If he is denied time, then follows that he is denied history (Pickering: 56). It places them in a different time than the present of the producers of the discourse, which further excludes them. The ‘Others’ are symbolically muted by being in the past of the production of discourse. Primitives were exhibited as spectacles in Europe, such as African tribes as the 'Kaffir' in London in 1853 or bushmen displayed as little above monkeys (Pickering: 58). The exhibitions were degrading for these cultures. They permitted the West to keep a control over the 'unknown' savage. The savagery under spectacle is under control this way. The primitive makes its way into popular culture, as it is accessible and familiarized by the general population and made real in popular minds. This is a case of the happy assimilation of the unknown to fit the society's needs and adapt it as an object of fascination. Furthermore, it brings forth the development of the West.

#### Our alternative is fluid cultural identity – vote neg to endorse cultural difference as socially constructed and historically contingent – only this can solve
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Stuart Hall gives an analysis of what cultural identity is and stands for and how it is constructed and its complexities. He states that there are at least two different ways of thinking about cultural identity (Hall, 1993: 223). The first of these two, which Hall acknowledges but doesn’t favor, understands identity as individuals bound together by either ethnicity or race, who share a common history and that this history is fixed and unchangeable. This fixed history, he says, gives common points of references and frames of meaning. Hall uses Frantz Fanon in explaining that the colonizing power “distorts”, “disfigures” and “destroys” the past of a colonized people, and therefore that a rediscovery of a beautiful past is very important to postcolonial societies. Hall also states that colonizing power even has the power to make the colonized people see themselves as others (Hall, 1993: 225). Hall discusses if the search for a beautiful past is not only a rediscovery of a past, but that it also serves another purpose: an attempt to retell the past. He states that: “‘Hidden histories’ have played a critical role in the emergence of many of the most important social movements of our time - feminist, anti-colonial and anti-racist” (Hall, 1993: 224). One can have a tendency to think of identity as an already established and finished product, but Hall’s view on cultural identity differs: “Instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a ‘production’, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view problematizes the very authority and authenticity to which the term, ‘cultural identity’, lays claim” (Hall: 222). Hall recognizes that people can share many similarities, but that we can’t really say that there exists any ‘one experience’ or identity; cultural Identity is historical but it is still in ‘constant transformation’ and is “...subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power” (Hall, 1993: 225)

### 1NC Indigeneity

#### The idea of the indigenous people as “protectors of the environment” creates a Westernized stereotype of indigenous populations that denies their identity and oversimplifies the ways people support extraction, which is an independent link turn
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This performance of indigenous peoples as protectors of natural environments, living in equilibrium with Mother Earth and relying upon an egalitarian democratic system or structure of ‘ayllu’ democracy resembles early anthropological representations of native peoples and their closed corporate communities. This body of litera- ture in the 1970s and 1980s focused on the ayllu as untouched by colonialism and expanding capitalism, and ‘lo Andino’ or Andeanism reflected a long ethnological area studies literature that imagined and understood native peoples in relation to ecologies, often in deterministic and essentialized ways (Isbell, 1977; Brush, 1977; Bastien, 1978; Allen, 1988). Orin Starn’s (1992) attack upon ethnographers for ‘missing the revolution,’ which he characterized as failure to understand how broader global and political economic shifts affect native or South American peoples, very much influenced a new wave of anthropology. However, despite his attempt to rewrite this problematic history, what most appeals to some Aymaras like Quispe is this very idea of ‘lo Andino:’ native peoples as timeless, grounded in rural realities, and inherently connected to local ecologies. In sharp contrast to the increasingly dynamic academic approaches to indigeneity, ‘the noble savage’ or ‘eco-Indian’ has traveled, been transformed, and deployed by indigenous peoples for political purposes (Dove, 2006). As Tom Perreault and Barbara Green (2013) argue, groups like CONAMAQ in the West and autonomous movements in the East mobilize essentialized understandings of indigenous identity in order to legitimate historical claims to territory and political rights. They are primarily interested in the ways in which indigeneity has come to inform conceptualizations of territory and of nation. Mobilizing indigeneity to claim rights to space, territory, or natural resource wealth has been important in concrete political projects like CONAMAQ or Camba Nation; but what happens when the same strategies travel into the realm of climate change? In this instance, romantic ideals of indigeneity serve as grounds for restitution for historic environmental injustice wrought by long histories of resource extraction. As Kohl and Farthing (2012) argue this dependency upon extraction has been referred to as the ‘resource curse,’ which they note has been a simplified way of looking at resource dependency. Nevertheless, from silver and gold mining in early history to much more recent natural gas extraction, the abundance of natural resource wealth has not benefitted Bolivia. Alongside such forms of extraction is environmental degradation. Linda Farthing (2009) has written about this kind of environmental injustice. She states: You don’t have to look far to see the destruction. Even the most casual visitor to La Paz is likely to cross the turbid, foaming waters of the Choqueyapu River, which cuts across the city, some of it underground. From its head-waters 21 miles to the north in the altiplano, the crystalline glacial flow tumbles into the magnificent basin that cradles La Paz and is transformed into an open sewer. Heavy metals from the Milluni mine some 20 miles northeast of La Paz, industrial waste from neighboring El Alto’s textile and food industries, and household garbage mix into a poisonous stew that races downhill to the community of Río Abajo. (Farthing, 2009, p. 26) This kind of environmental degradation has disrupted ways of life for many indigen- ous communities. Some communities have been unable to use the waterways for agriculture and been displaced as a result of such ‘a toxic and poisonous stew.’ As indigenous peoples search for answers, then, it seems reasonable that representatives like Quispe would blame both capitalism and socialism as being equally destructive in terms of ‘harming the environment.’ While both capitalism and socialism have track records in terms of environmental degradation, Pre-columbian ways of life are imagined as purer and more ecologically sustainable. What is somehow left out of this conversation is the ways in which indigenous peoples have contributed to the development of capitalism and benefited from extractive industries that have wreaked havoc upon the natural environment. Some scholars of the Amazon have pointed out the ways in which indigenous communities have been involved in extractive industries such as logging instead of conserving ‘their forests’, as happened with the Kayapo (Turner, 1995). Further, anthropologist Juliet Erazo (2013) discusses the REDD+ projects8 (reducing emis- sions from deforestation by purchasing carbon credits) and the ways in which particular indigenous communities see the benefit in commoditizing nature for much-needed infrastructure development. As problematic as REDD+ projects are when it comes to commoditizing nature, these indigenous groups do not necessarily place themselves inside the noble savage slot, but rather see the advantages of these market-based mechanisms. Despite Jose Antonio Zamora Gutierrez’ (Bolivia’s current Minister on the Environment and Water) proclamations that these mechanisms make indigenous peoples believe that they will provide enough resources to solve poverty in peasant communities,9 Erazo (2012) illustrates how some natives see REDD+ programs as improving the well-being of their communities and leading directly to much-needed development. Much contemporary anthropological work on indigeneity captures the ways native communities take part in these kinds of market-based mechanisms (McNeish, 2013), yet indigenous movements like CONAMAQ fail to capture this dynamism in their political work and discourse. Increasingly more problematic and dangerous has been the migration of these discourses from national agendas to international arenas as solution to the climate crisis.

#### Their representations of indigenous people as having a pre-development way of life symbolically affirms the West as superior, hierarchically imposes essentialist views on other cultures, and transform the “primitive” into a spectacle – the way you frame your arguments matters
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The postcolonial subject is one which has frequently been represented in relation to Western imperialist discourse, benefitting and reinforcing prevailing dominant power structures. (Moreira- Slepoy: 11) Postcolonial dynamics are characterised by underlying power distributions between the coloniser and colonised, where the former exerts his power and authority over the colonized. Interferences with what were generally indigenous cultures have been conducted in the name of development, out of good will to help the colonized achieve similar “civilized” ways as the colonizer himself. This civilizing process was achieved in part through the use of representation as a means of control by spreading Western Imperialist discourse through essentialist views. In philosophy, the essential properties of an object, in contrast to accidental properties, are qualities which are necessary to an object’s being, and without which it could not possibly ‘be’. They are thus essential to its existence. Accidental properties, however, refer to certain qualities which an object might possess, but might also not have possessed (Robertson). In relation to this, one might have an essentialist view on culture. This leads one to understanding cultural ways as natural (common knowledge), not recognizing social construct, which presents a danger when one tries to impose these ‘truths’ on a culture presenting differing ways of life. We will investigate the impact of stereotypes on a population, and its use as an effective medium of coercion. During imperialist times, European colonial power was not solely maintained through military means. In fact, representations of the colonial subject were used as a tool in promoting their discourse. (MOREIRA-SLEPOY: 2) The images circulating depicting the colonized were controlled and manipulated which was a powerful tool of coercion. According to Said, “...we live in a world not only of commodities but also of representations, and representations-their production, circulation, history, and interpretation are the very element of culture-” (MOREIRA-SLEPOY: 1) These representations have represented the colonized as a deviant Other, bringing him to a fixed and static position. For Homi Bhabha, fixity is: “...the sign of cultural/historical/racial difference in the discourse of colonialism, which is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition” (IBID). Thus, this fixity is a strategy used by essentialist dominating powers to enforce their ways over the colonies through representation whilst ensuring a continuation of their discourse. The ensuring of one’s power through representation will be developed later in the chapter. In terms of the colonized responses to the representations, Dubois has proposed what she refers to as double consciousness, which is: “...a peculiar sensation, [...] this sense of always looking at one's self through the eyes of others, of measuring one's soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his twoness” (Du Bois: 3-4). What Dubois is claiming here is that when being oppressed, the colonised starts to look at themselves through the eyes of the colonisers, internalising the stereotyped constructions of their identity which leads to a mimicking of the colonizer’s ways. However, while the colonised feel an urge to comply with the dominant discourse, they also intuitively feel the need to find alternative ways of resisting. The postcolonial subject will unconsciously try to gain acceptance by internalizing the dominant essential discourses, thereby mimicking the representations viewed. In Homi Bhabha’s words, this mimicry may be understood as “one of the most elusive and effective strategies of colonial power and knowledge”. He adds that this strategy aims at creating «a reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite.” This implies that the colonized should internalise and embody Western discourse, while however still remaining an Other. These ideological representations were, naturally, derogative, portraying the colonized as a degenerate or primitive being (Bhabha: 85-86). In terms of aesthetics, Western works were considered as surpassing any other forms of art. These were left unquestioned, considered as universal truths. In fact, Schwarz states that: “...a conception of art which views itself as transcending ideology even as it raises a single object, English literature, to the status of self- contained totality” to point to the essentialist views of the prior (Schwarz: 21). Binary thought is characteristic of imperialist discourse, and can be seen when a representation is made through divisions of Self/Other. This Othering can also be done through the representing of Others as a mythical or exotic creature. Edward Said has contributed greatly to this process which he terms Orientalisation: “The Orient was almost a European invention, and had been since antiquity a place of romance, exotic beings, haunting memories and landscapes, remarkable experiences” (Said: 87). Thus, the Occident/Orient dichotomy is a socially constructed one which has a history and tradition. These mechanisms of representation established through degradation or exoticism are employed to symbolically force subjects into internalizing dominant discourses, entering the collective consciousness of the people, thus reinforcing governing power relations. This is obviously an essentialist stance where one does not question essentially natural and habitual ways of life, enforcing them on others who ‘do not know better’. Through this binary way of perceiving, a hierarchical view where the self is perceived as superior to the Other is established. The self is also the ‘normal’ one, and in this sense, the Other is a sort of alien. In this section, we will make a brief historical overview of the west ́s hegemonic power over the Native Americans. The image we have of the Native Americans today is a simplified western construction which is not adequate with the complexity of Native American culture, history and their self-representations. (Harlan et al: 202) This demonstrates the way power can be used to enforce dominant ideologies. In Robert Berkhoffer's The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present he writes that: “Since Whites primarily understood the Indian as an antithesis to themselves, then civilization and Indianness as they defined them would forever be opposites.” (Robert Berkhofer, Jr., The White Man’s Indian: Images of the American Indian from Columbus to the Present, New York: First Vintage Books Edition, A Division of Random House, 1979, p. 29) Indians exist not as having their holistic culture and history but as a dichotomy to us, and therefore dependent on us. If the Indian exists only in relation to being what 'white is not', then the Indian is truly Indian if he remains excluded from civilization and maintains his traditional culture. He is therefore an ahistorical and decontextualized being. When American anthropology developed in the 1890's, artifact collecting became popular amongst intellectuals. Later, in the twentieth century, tourism expanded and the general public started collecting artifacts. According to Brody and Garmhausen, it is between 1900 and 1917 that white intervention amongst Native art began in the Southwest (Harlan et al: 217). Anthropologists or Indian traders went to various Indian tribes and provided the Natives with material for painting. They were asked to make paintings regarding tribal ceremonies. These paintings were bought and exhibited at museums or used for research. These paintings are therefore not 'authentic' in relation to the western definition of authentic which is not influenced by Western culture. They are paintings seeking to please the white market. By the 1920's, there were over a dozen of Indians who produced these 'Native paintings' for white customers in areas such as in Santa Fe, Taos and New Mexico. Two of these became a market which remains the largest 'Indian art' venues today (Gallup Inter Tribal Indian Ceremonial and Santa Fe Indian Market) (IBID). A larger event was held in 1931 in New York. This National Indian Art show emphasized that Indians were a dying race and that their culture needed preserving. As the demand for Native art increased, more Indians participated in the making of this art (IBID). From the 1930's onwards, art was seen as a process for economic growth. For this reason, art, which assured the continuation of 'Native art' was incorporated into boarding schools as part of the curriculum (Harlan et al: 216). The Santa Fe boarding school is an example of this. The teachers were non Native American and taught Native American students to use techniques and subjects which conformed to the idea of the Vanishing Indian. This school aimed to preserve Indian art through techniques which were said to be ‘authentic’. Dorothy Dunn, the director of the Santa Fe art school decided that the art produced was to be sold exclusively for the Indian Market. This way of making art was known as the Studio style. The students were told to look in their backgrounds for tribal themes to depict and were refused any other topic. The subjects were traditional ceremonial and tribal scenes, and plants and animals, using a flat, decorative, linear style. (Ojibwa) It is important to note that although Dorothy Dunn scholarized the studio style to fit the demands of the white market, several techniques were already present in Native American culture before the arrival of settlers. For example, she introduced the use of earth color paintings in 1933 to reproduce the colors traditionally used in painting pottery and ceremonial objects. (Ojibwa) example of a studio-style painting, by Joe Herrera, Cochiti “Men’s arrow Dance” 1938 In 1959, The Rockefeller conference took place at the university of Arizona. The aim of this conference was to discuss ways to preserve and expand Southwest Indian art. Dorothy Dunn supported the idea that Indian studio style art was ahistorical:.”Indian painting is, first of all, art, but in the greater implications of human relationships and history it is something more—something perhaps of a genetic aspect in the riddle of mankind. Unless the legends, songs, ceremonies, and other native customs are recorded by the people themselves, painting must continue to be the principal contributor of Indian thought to the world art and history.” (Harlan et al: 219) Dorothy Dunn is placing the Indians beyond history and context thus bringing them to a more universal and mystical level of mankind. Lloyd New went against the ideas held by the conference concerning the idea of the vanishing Indian: ”Let’s admit, sadly if you must, that the hey-dey of Indian life is past, or passing. Let’s also admit that art with all peoples has been a manifestation of the lives of those people, reflecting the truth of the times. And if Indian culture is in a state of flux then we must expect a corresponding art” (IBID). In the late fifties and early sixties, there was a shift in Indian Art. Until then, it had only been outsiders who spoke on behalf of Native American culture. This started changing slowly. In October 1959, workshops were organized by organizers of the University of Arizona for young Indian artists. It was in order to help the younger generation during a time of conflict between traditional and contemporary viewpoints. The workshops did not only focus on Indian painting as seen in the Studio Art movement. They learned from both Indian anthropological resources and historic and contemporary Western art sources and were taught by both Indian and Anglo instructors (IBID). In 1962, the Santa Fe boarding school was replaced by the Institute of American Indian Arts (also known as IAIA). Three Native American instructors were hired as instructors of the school. They broadened the fields of Native Arts so it did not only encompass painting. This period was known as the post-studio style and golden period. American Indian studies later became available at universities which caused competition for the IAIA. Modern artists began detaching themselves from the techniques of the industry and developed their own techniques. The art produced was for a larger audience, in opposition to the Studio Style. New artists became renowned for being artists and not only Native Artists. Furthermore, by the mid- 2000s a new generation of artists started to create socially critical works (Harlan et al: 221). Museums have broadened the boundaries of Indian Arts so that they are in accordance with modernity (and not only the 'authentic' Indian image from the Indian Market.) This is the case of the exhibition New maternities in a post Indian world at the National Museum of the American Indian (IBID). This museum collaborates with Native communities and gives place to the voices of contemporary Indigenous as exhibitions are from the Native perspective. Theory of Representation of Stereotypes Stereotyping is defined as a ”one-sided characterization of others, and as a general process, stereotyping is a unilinear mode of representing them.” (Pickering: 47). The two stereotypes which are relevant in relation to the case of Native American representation are the concepts of the 'Other' and the 'primitive', which is derived from the former. As shall be investigated further in the project, Native Americans have been subjected to various stereotypes. Stereotypes are strong tools of representation as they allow symbolic control over the one who is stereotyped. As we have seen in the previous chapter, stereotypes are maintained by those in power. They have the ability to “reduce everything about the person to those traits, exaggerate and simplify them, and fix them without change or development to eternity” (Hall, 1997: 258). As a symbolic process it is effective, as people can take it as being true. Firstly, we shall attempt to explain that due to its naturalized appearance the stereotype can be efficient and thus create a symbolic control over the other. Secondly, we shall establish the various ways in which it maintains symbolic control. These manifest themselves partly through symbolic expulsion of the ‘Other’. The control over space and time is an important aspect here. This is primarily the case in the stereotyping of the primitive. We shall see that control over time and space leads to a denial of history. Stereotyping involves a process of objectification of the ‘Other’, which leaves the other in a position where his cultural identity will be damaged with no possibility for change. Stereotypes are able to have an effect on both those stereotyping and those being stereotyped. It is for this reason that we can speak of a symbolic control. It is not the stereotype in itself which is powerful, but the legitimacy that people grant it. When people start taking it as being true and act in accordance to it, the power of the stereotype takes place. As we have formerly observed, power relations play a role on representations. This is in relation to the hegemonic relations and structures within a society(ies). Bourdieu states that: “The cultural arbitrary is used by dominant groups or classes because it expresses completely although always in a mediated way the objective and material interests of the dominant group” (Rajan: 139). This means that representations can appear to us as natural, as they reflect underlying power relations. Indeed, due to the power relations at play, what is culturally arbitrary takes on a quasi- cognitive dimension, as if they could be demonstrated objectively or separately from culture (Pickering :70). If stereotypes take on a naturalized form, then they can hardly change. The association with essentialism is clear here. Cultural values take on naturalized dimensions and appear to have an innate and universal existence rather than taken as being cultural constructs (Merriam-Webster). Therefore, the stereotype appears to us as 'true' and ‘transparent'. The stereotype then reaches a neutral level and is disguised. It needs to be masked in order to exercise its power (Pickering: 70). The construction of the ‘Other’ can be explained in relation to power relations. In relation to hegemony, those who possess the power have the ability to regulate the norms of society in their interest. In order to maintain their position, they ensure the exclusion of those who do not possess power. (Hugh). Those who do not fit into society’s norms are deviants. They do not go unnoticed. For “what is taken as normal is usually taken for granted and left unquestioned” (Pickering: 70). The opposite also applies that what is not normal or deviant is noticed. In The Second Sex, de Beauvoir illustrates this in relation to gender: “He is the Subject, he is the Absolute - she is the ‘Other’” (Pickering: 64). This could be applied to other social categories such as race, ethnicity etc. Those who possess the power possess the means to construct the discourses. They define themselves in contrast to the ‘Others’. The ‘Others’ do not have the means of defining themselves, but instead identify themselves through the dominant groups’ self-definition. This is a denial of identity as it “...divests them of their social and cultural identities by diminishing them to their stereotyped definitions.” (Pickering: 73). Furthermore, this recognition of oneself as ‘Other’ violates individual autonomy and independence as the subject is objectified as complementary to another subject in order to be. Stereotyping can thereafter cast the 'Other' on the social periphery. By distancing the 'Other', it unifies the sense of social identity of the ones placed at the symbolic center. The need for this symbolic centrality suggests two causes: ”...either a fear of what cannot be admitted into an ordered identity, or a critical lack, an absence in the presence of identity which demands that the other be turned into an object of happy assimilation” (Pickering: 49) It can be said that the 'Other' is accomplishing the needs of solving fantasies of those engaged in the process of stereotyping. In this way, stereotypes reveal more about the ones stereotyping than the one being stereotyped: “The Other is always constructed as an object for the benefit of the subject who stands in a need of an objectified other in order to achieve a masterly self-definition” (Pickering: 71) Defining the Other is first and foremost to define the self. In order to understand the construction of the stereotype of the primitive, it is necessary to look back into history to when the term was first used, as the view on the primitive today is still based on this imperial history (Pickering: 52). The term primitive is the binary opposite of the term modernity. The notion of the 'primitive' became widely used in the nineteenth century (though it had existed since the Columbian times (Pickering: 51). As the concept of the 'Other', the primitive fulfilled the task of mirroring the West, more particularly in their own development. The primitive is seen as antithesis to development. Darwin's evolutionism was an important contribution to the transition from the traditional to the modern society (Pickering: 52). This led to an interest in studying 'primitive' societies, which lacked any sense of development concerning empirical and rational knowledge. The primitive was therefore the opposite of the civilized modern individual. Founded on evolutionism was the eugenics movement, initiated by Francis Galton who justified superiority of races by stating that physically inherent characteristics had bred Europeans into modern civilized beings (Pickering: 53). The dominion of Europeans over other less scientifically developed cultures was confirmed and the existence of races confirmed. The construction of races carries many consequences. Along with it is the idea that the 'primitive' cultures lack the innate abilities to develop, which Europeans have. This legitimizes Europeans' right to control these cultures, in order to develop them. It also puts the West at the symbolic center and every other culture on the margin due to being modern and therefore superior. We can note that due to the fact that the primitives serve as a mirror for Western development, Darwin's theory of Evolution brought a hierarchical model within social development where development was the dynamic of evolution (with the West at one end and the primitive cultures at the other). According to this thought, every culture goes through the same stages in relation to this scale of progress, following the path of Europe. This brings every culture as dependent to the West on an inferior level, as they will all follow the same stages of development the West has undergone. The Other serves to indicate how far Western civilization has developed. The West is therefore the reference point to other cultures as it is the most developed. These cultures serve the purpose of a ”living fossil” for the West, as a mirror of the stage that Europe had gone through long ago. They are in fact so underdeveloped that they represent a form of human existence which is”...backward, unchanging, simple form of human existence which the West had long left behind” (Pickering: 54). As the primitive is placed into the past of the West, it creates a division in time around the globe where different cultures are living in different times. Living in the past does not leave space for them to change their position on a symbolic level. We can notice a temporalization of geographical spaces. As mentioned above, temporality is divided in stages regarding the Western model of modernity. The primitive is so underdeveloped that he does not have a place on the scale. Consequently, he is denied time. If he is denied time, then follows that he is denied history (Pickering: 56). It places them in a different time than the present of the producers of the discourse, which further excludes them. The ‘Others’ are symbolically muted by being in the past of the production of discourse. Primitives were exhibited as spectacles in Europe, such as African tribes as the 'Kaffir' in London in 1853 or bushmen displayed as little above monkeys (Pickering: 58). The exhibitions were degrading for these cultures. They permitted the West to keep a control over the 'unknown' savage. The savagery under spectacle is under control this way. The primitive makes its way into popular culture, as it is accessible and familiarized by the general population and made real in popular minds. This is a case of the happy assimilation of the unknown to fit the society's needs and adapt it as an object of fascination. Furthermore, it brings forth the development of the West.

#### The colonial project destroys local culture, recasting what it means to be human. Colonialism is the complete physical and ideological destruction of the world of the colonized.

Jayan Nayar 99 [Professor in the School of Law at the University of Warwick, 1999 “Orders of Inhumanity”, Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems, Fall, Lexis]

Despite the vision of world-order founded on a notion of a universal society of humankind aspiring toward a universal common good, (first given meaning within a conceptual political-legal framework through the birth of the so-called "Westphalian" state system), the materialities of "ordering" were of a different complexion altogether. Contrary to the disembodied rhetoric of world-order as bloodless evolution, the new images of the world and languages of "globality" did not evolve out of a sense of "hospitality" <=16> n15 to the "other," the "stranger." Rather, the history of the creation of the post-Westphalian "world" as one world, can be seen to be most intimately connected with the rise of an expansionist and colonizing world-view and practice. Voyages of "discovery" provided the necessary reconnaissance to image this "new world." Bit by bit, piece by piece, the jigsaw of the globe was completed. With the advance of the "discoverer," the "colonizer," the "invader," the "new" territories were given meaning within the hermeneutic construct that was the new "world." [\*607] The significance of this evolution of the world does not, however, lie merely in its acquiring meaning. It is not simply the "idea" of the world that was brought to prominence through acts of colonization. The construction of the "stage" of the world has also occurred, albeit amid the performance of a violent drama upon it. The idea of a single world in need of order was followed by a succession of chained and brutalized bodies of the "other." The embodied world that has been in creation from the "colonial" times to the present could not, and does not, accommodate plurality. The very idea of "one world" contains the necessary impetus for the absorption, assimilation, if not destruction, of existing worlds and the genocide of existing socialities. This violence of "ordering" within the historical epoch of colonialism is now plainly visible. Through "colonialism" was reshaped the material basis of exchange that determined human relationships. Put differently, the very idea of what is "human" was recast by the imposed value-systems of the "civilizing" process that was colonialism. To be human, to live, and to relate to others, thus, both lost and gained meaning. Lost were many pre-colonial and indigenous conceptions of human dignity, of subsistence, production, consumption, wealth and poverty. Gained was the advent of the human "self' as an objective "economic" agent and, with it, the universals of commodification as the basis for human relations. Following this transformation of the material political-economy of the colonized, or "ordered," colonialism entrenched the "state" as the symbolic "political" institution of "public" social relations. The effect of this "colonization of the mind" was that the "political-economic" form of social organization--the state--was universalized as common, if not "natural," resulting in a homogenization of "political" imagination and language. Thus, diversity was unified, while at the same time, unity was diversified. The particularities and inconveniences of human diversity--culture and tradition--were subordinated to the "civilized" discourse of secular myths (to which the "rule of law" is central), <=17> n16 while concurrently, humanity was formally segregated into artificial "states," enclosures of mythic solidarities and common destinies. This brief remembering of colonialism as an historic process, provides us with the most explicit lessons on the violence of the "ordering" of "worlds." From its history we see that an important feature of ordering prevails.The world of those who "order" is the destruction of the "worlds" of those ordered. So many ideologies of negation and (re)creation served to justify this "beginning"--terra nullius, the "savage" native, the "civilizing mission." <=18> n17 The [\*608] "world," after all, had to be created out of all this "unworldly" miasma, all for the common good of the universal society of humankind, Although historical colonialism as a formal structure of politico-legal ordering of humanity has come and gone, the violence of colonization is very much a persistent reality. A striking feature of historical world-orderings was the confidence with which the "new world" was projected upon human imagination. Colonialism was not a tentative process. The "right" of colonization, both as a right of the colonizer and as a right thing to do by the colonizer, was passionately believed and confidently asserted. Thus, for the most part, this "right" was uncontested, this confidence unchallenged. "World-order" today is similarly asserted with confidence and rectitude, Contemporary world-orderings, consistent with those of the past, are implemented using a range of civilizational legitimization. With the advent of an ideology of "humanity," a "post-colonial" concession to human dignity demanded by the previously colonized, new languages of the civilizational project had to be conceived of and projected. "Freed" from the brutalities of the order of historical colonialism, the "ordered" now are subjected to the colonizing force of the "post-colonial," and increasingly, globalization-inspired ideologies of development and security. Visible, still, is the legitimization of "order" as coercive command through the rhetoric of "order" as evolutionary structure. A. Contemporary Ideologies of Colonization The promise of "new beginnings" has been a constant feature in the rhetoric of post-colonial world-orders, for, after all, new beginnings have a certain captivating allure. "Liberation" from the old has found utterance in a myriad of slogans--independence, peace, security, nation-building, democracy, development, prosperity--made during Party Annual General Meetings, with launches of National Development Plans, or at the lavish settings of the United Nations and international Conferences. With the passing of the blemished age of colonialism, the powerful--national governments, the UN, the World Bank and IMF, and even those countries who individually and severally brutalized and pillaged the formerly "uncivilized"--are now willing, it would seem, to get into the act of creating the "new age" of welfare for all. New beginnings, and more new beginnings, the (once) new United Nations, <=19> n18 the (now dead) New International Economic [\*609] Order, the (still-born) new "sustainable development," the (old) New World-Order, each grand promise of tomorrow ushered in, tired and haggard, but accompanied with much frenzied trumpeting.

#### Our alternative is fluid cultural identity – vote neg to endorse cultural difference as socially constructed and historically contingent – only this can solve

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

Stuart Hall gives an analysis of what cultural identity is and stands for and how it is constructed and its complexities. He states that there are at least two different ways of thinking about cultural identity (Hall, 1993: 223). The first of these two, which Hall acknowledges but doesn’t favor, understands identity as individuals bound together by either ethnicity or race, who share a common history and that this history is fixed and unchangeable. This fixed history, he says, gives common points of references and frames of meaning. Hall uses Frantz Fanon in explaining that the colonizing power “distorts”, “disfigures” and “destroys” the past of a colonized people, and therefore that a rediscovery of a beautiful past is very important to postcolonial societies. Hall also states that colonizing power even has the power to make the colonized people see themselves as others (Hall, 1993: 225). Hall discusses if the search for a beautiful past is not only a rediscovery of a past, but that it also serves another purpose: an attempt to retell the past. He states that: “‘Hidden histories’ have played a critical role in the emergence of many of the most important social movements of our time - feminist, anti-colonial and anti-racist” (Hall, 1993: 224). One can have a tendency to think of identity as an already established and finished product, but Hall’s view on cultural identity differs: “Instead of thinking of identity as an already accomplished fact, which the new cultural practices then represent, we should think, instead, of identity as a ‘production’, which is never complete, always in process, and always constituted within, not outside, representation. This view problematizes the very authority and authenticity to which the term, ‘cultural identity’, lays claim” (Hall: 222). Hall recognizes that people can share many similarities, but that we can’t really say that there exists any ‘one experience’ or identity; cultural Identity is historical but it is still in ‘constant transformation’ and is “...subject to the continuous ‘play’ of history, culture and power” (Hall, 1993: 225)

Continues

Through the project we have seen how essentialist views with myth of purity have shaped western understandings of the Other, and thus representations of the Other. As previously argued, these views have advanced the Other in binary terms and alleged him to a fixed position, where stereotypes were beneficial strategies to promote these visions whilst ensuring the maintenance of power. In fact, this position does not allow space for change. Common essentialist stereotypes included infantilization, authentication, villainization and fetishism. These simplified versions of the natives served to attenuate the threat of a eugenic population which haunted the white colonizers at the time, and are still present now. Furthermore, as discussed in the chapter on Representation, when the Other is not understood, he is ‘translated’ as These essentialist ways of perceiving still dominate our understanding of the Others now, where imperialism is embedded within the collective consciousness of the people. In order to confront the static and derogatory position which the native has been subject to, responses to this essentialist way of representing have been made. One way of countering essentialist representations is to call for hybridity. In fact, the term is enticing, calling for the refusal of a fixed position and providing an alternative to binary thinking, agency for the oppressed and a destructuring of power (Prabhu: 1). This seems to be a relevant and beneficial tool to counter dominant and oppressive discourses in a postcolonial context. The discussion will aim to examine this aspect of Native American responses to mainstream representations, namely how hybridity is used to counter common essentialist views on cultures. To understand how this is done, we will study two photographs taken by the American Indian artists Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie and Zig Jackson, who are renowned for their use of irony in playing with the Indian stereotype. We will now demonstrate how the selected photographies support hybridity.

### Impact Weighing

#### Our impacts come first – decolonization requires the resistance to symbolic, not direct, violence

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie and Zig Jackson are both twentieth century American Indian photographers who, as we shall demonstrate, are engaged in their work regarding Native Americans. As mentioned above, they are excluded from society and living in harsh conditions. Furthermore, because of Western colonization and all of the above-mentioned power struggles this entails, they are left with a damaged cultural image: “We were treated as though we were the problem. Colonization left us with a negative self-esteem as a race.” (Burning) Because of this, there is a need amongst the Native American population to: “decolonize entire communities held in the grip of damaging non-tribal ideologies.” (Cook-Lynn) Here, the setting is a post-colonial one, and therefore it is not direct violence that the natives are countering, but the oppressive power of imperialism that lingers in the colonized minds, which means power on a symbolic level.

### Framework

#### Our alternative is a prior question – representations matter so you should vote negative because the alternative represents cultural identity in a more productive way than the aff

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

Stuart Hall, who was born in Jamaica and spent his childhood there, actually begins his discussion on Cultural Identity and Diaspora by discussing the cinema of the Caribbean which he says joins the other “Third Cinemas” (a political and aesthetic project that have guided filmmakers from regions with colonial struggles, addresses problems connected to race, class and gender and to post-colonial struggles) but differs from the Afro-Caribbean’s various other ways and forms of visual representation (Dodge). He speaks of the important or crucial role that Third Cinema has had in producing representations that negotiate the cultural identities of the third world diasporic people against the representations in the dominant western regimes. Third Cinema provides and allows these people to recognize different histories and aspects of themselves. The new representations provide new and negotiated positions from which these people speak of themselves. Hall states that “Practices of representation always implicate the positions from which we speak or write... ...nevertheless who speaks, and the subject who is spoken of, are never identical...”(Hall, 1993: 222). Hall states that through difference and transformation diasporic identities produce and reproduce themselves constantly. (Hall, 1993: 235) He also discusses diasporic aesthetics and uses Dick Hebdige in explaining it: “Across a whole range of cultural forms there is a ‘syncretic’ dynamic which critically appropriates elements from the master-codes of the dominant culture,...” (Hall, 1993: 236) Analysis Representations and discourses are controlled by the dominant group and permit symbolic control over the ‘Other’ by symbolically excluding and expulsing him. This is possible due to the power relations at play in relation to hegemony. Essentialized social constructs have been taken as true due to different historical and social happenings. As we have elicited in the chapter concerning stereotypes, eugenics and social darwinism were partly the factors contributing and involved in this essentialized thought. Essentialized views explain what is socially constructed and arbitrary as if it were natural and legitimate. Stereotypes and myths can be associated to essentialist views as they function similarly. Indeed, the effectiveness of the stereotype is that it appears as natural, taking on a quasi-cognitive dimension. The three representations which we have decided to base ourselves on are Native Americans as romanticized through innocence, the myth of the authentic as a Dying Race, and the savage as villain or Noble Savage.

#### This is the role of your ballot since critical intellectualism is key to effective social action and educational space.

Jones 99—IR, Aberystwyth (Richard, “6. Emancipation: Reconceptualizing Practice,” Security, Strategy and Critical Theory, http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html, AMiles)

The central political task of the intellectuals is to aid in the construction of a counterhegemony and thus undermine the prevailing patterns of discourse and interaction that make up the currently dominant hegemony. This task is accomplished through educational activity, because, as Gramsci argues, “every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily a pedagogic relationship” (Gramsci 1971: 350). Discussing the relationship of the “philosophy of praxis” to political practice, Gramsci claims: It [the theory] does not tend to leave the “simple” in their primitive philosophy of common sense, but rather to lead them to a higher conception of life. If it affirms the need for contact between intellectuals and “simple” it is not in order to restrict scientific activity and preserve unity at the low level of the masses, but precisely in order to construct an intellectual–moral bloc which can make politically possible the intellectual progress of the mass and not only of small intellectual groups. (Gramsci 1971: 332–333) According to Gramsci, this attempt to construct an alternative “intellectual–moral bloc” should take place under the auspices of the Communist Party—a body he described as the “modern prince.” Just as Niccolò Machiavelli hoped to see a prince unite Italy, rid the country of foreign barbarians, and create a virtù–ous state, Gramsci believed that the modern prince could lead the working class on its journey toward its revolutionary destiny of an emancipated society (Gramsci 1971: 125–205). Gramsci’s relative optimism about the possibility of progressive theorists playing a constructive role in emancipatory political practice was predicated on his belief in the existence of a universal class (a class whose emancipation would inevitably presage the emancipation of humanity itself) with revolutionary potential. It was a gradual loss of faith in this axiom that led Horkheimer and Adorno to their extremely pessimistic prognosis about the possibilities of progressive social change. But does a loss of faith in the revolutionary vocation of the proletariat necessarily lead to the kind of quietism ultimately embraced by the first generation of the Frankfurt School? The conflict that erupted in the 1960s between them and their more radical students suggests not. Indeed, contemporary critical theorists claim that the deprivileging of the role of the proletariat in the struggle for emancipation is actually a positive move. Class remains a very important axis of domination in society, but it is not the only such axis (Fraser 1995). Nor is it valid to reduce all other forms of domination—for example, in the case of gender—to class relations, as orthodox Marxists tend to do. To recognize these points is not only a first step toward the development of an analysis of forms of exploitation and exclusion within society that is more attuned to social reality; it is also a realization that there are other forms of emancipatory politics than those associated with class conflict. 1 This in turn suggests new possibilities and problems for emancipatory theory. Furthermore, the abandonment of faith in revolutionary parties is also a positive development. The history of the European left during the twentieth century provides myriad examples of the ways in which the fetishization of party organizations has led to bureaucratic immobility and the confusion of means with ends (see, for example, Salvadori 1990). The failure of the Bolshevik experiment illustrates how disciplined, vanguard parties are an ideal vehicle for totalitarian domination (Serge 1984). Faith in the “infallible party” has obviously been the source of strength and comfort to many in this period and, as the experience of the southern Wales coalfield demonstrates, has inspired brave and progressive behavior (see, for example, the account of support for the Spanish Republic in Francis 1984). But such parties have so often been the enemies of emancipation that they should be treated with the utmost caution. Parties are necessary, but their fetishization is potentially disastrous. History furnishes examples of progressive developments that have been positively influenced by organic intellectuals operating outside the bounds of a particular party structure (G. Williams 1984). Some of these developments have occurred in the particularly intractable realm of security. These examples may be considered as “resources of hope” for critical security studies (R. Williams 1989). They illustrate that ideas are important or, more correctly, that change is the product of the dialectical interaction of ideas and material reality. One clear security–related example of the role of critical thinking and critical thinkers in aiding and abetting progressive social change is the experience of the peace movement of the 1980s. At that time the ideas of dissident defense intellectuals (the “alternative defense” school) encouraged and drew strength from peace activism. Together they had an effect not only on short–term policy but on the dominant discourses of strategy and security, a far more important result in the long run. The synergy between critical security intellectuals and critical social movements and the potential influence of both working in tandem can be witnessed particularly clearly in the fate of common security. As Thomas Risse–Kappen points out, the term “common security” originated in the contribution of peace researchers to the German security debate of the 1970s (Risse–Kappen 1994: 186ff.); it was subsequently popularized by the Palme Commission report (Independent Commission on Disarmament and Security Issues 1982). Initially, mainstream defense intellectuals dismissed the concept as hopelessly idealistic; it certainly had no place in their allegedly hardheaded and realist view of the world. However, notions of common security were taken up by a number of different intellectual communities, including the liberal arms control community in the United States, Western European peace researchers, security specialists in the center–left political parties of Western Europe, and Soviet “institutchiks”—members of the influential policy institutes in the Soviet Union such as the United States of America and Canada Institute (Landau 1996: 52–54; Risse–Kappen 1994: 196–200; Kaldor 1995; Spencer 1995). These communities were subsequently able to take advantage of public pressure exerted through social movements in order to gain broader acceptance for common security. In Germany, for example, “in response to social movement pressure, German social organizations such as churches and trade unions quickly supported the ideas promoted by peace researchers and the SPD” (Risse–Kappen 1994: 207). Similar pressures even had an effect on the Reagan administration. As Risse–Kappen notes: When the Reagan administration brought hard–liners into power, the US arms control community was removed from policy influence. It was the American peace movement and what became known as the “freeze campaign” that revived the arms control process together with pressure from the European allies. (Risse–Kappen 1994: 205; also Cortright 1993: 90–110) Although it would be difficult to sustain a claim that the combination of critical movements andintellectuals persuaded the Reagan government to adopt the rhetoric and substance of common security in its entirety, it is clear that it did at least have a substantial impact on ameliorating U.S. behavior. The most dramatic and certainly the most unexpected impact of alternative defense ideas was felt in the Soviet Union. Through various East–West links, which included arms control institutions, Pugwash conferences, interparty contacts, and even direct personal links, a coterie of Soviet policy analysts and advisers were drawn toward common security and such attendant notions as “nonoffensive defense” (these links are detailed in Evangelista 1995; Kaldor 1995; Checkel 1993; Risse–Kappen 1994; Landau 1996 and Spencer 1995 concentrate on the role of the Pugwash conferences). This group, including Palme Commission member Georgii Arbatov, Pugwash attendee Andrei Kokoshin, and Sergei Karaganov, a senior adviser who was in regular contact with the Western peace researchers Anders Boserup and Lutz Unterseher (Risse–Kappen 1994: 203), then influenced Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. Gorbachev’s subsequent championing of common security may be attributed to several factors. It is clear, for example, that new Soviet leadership had a strong interest in alleviating tensions in East–West relations in order to facilitate much–needed domestic reforms (“the interaction of ideas and material reality”). But what is significant is that the Soviets’ commitment to common security led to significant changes in force sizes and postures. These in turn aided in the winding down of the Cold War, the end of Soviet domination over Eastern Europe, and even the collapse of Russian control over much of the territory of the former Soviet Union. At the present time, in marked contrast to the situation in the early 1980s, common security is part of the common sense of security discourse. As MccGwire points out, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (a common defense pact) is using the rhetoric of common security in order to justify its expansion into Eastern Europe (MccGwire 1997). This points to an interesting and potentially important aspect of the impact of ideas on politics. As concepts such as common security, and collective security before it (Claude 1984: 223–260), are adopted by governments and military services, they inevitably become somewhat debased. The hope is that enough of the residual meaning can survive to shift the parameters of the debate in a potentially progressive direction. Moreover, the adoption of the concept of common security by official circles provides critics with a useful tool for (immanently) critiquing aspects of security policy (as MccGwire 1997 demonstrates in relation to NATO expansion). The example of common security is highly instructive. First, it indicates that critical intellectuals can be politically engaged and play a role—a significant one at that—in making the world a better and safer place. Second, it points to potential future addressees for critical international theory in general, and critical security studies in particular. Third, it also underlines the role of ideas in the evolution of society. Although most proponents of critical security studies reject aspects of Gramsci’s theory of organic intellectuals, in particular his exclusive concentration on class and his emphasis on the guiding role of the party, the desire for engagement and relevance must remain at the heart of their project. The example of the peace movement suggests that critical theorists can still play the role of organic intellectuals and that this organic relationship need not confine itself to a single class; it can involve alignment with different coalitions of social movements that campaign on an issue or a series of issues pertinent to the struggle for emancipation (Shaw 1994b; R. Walker 1994). Edward Said captures this broader orientation when he suggests that critical intellectuals “are always tied to and ought to remain an organic part of an ongoing experience in society: of the poor, the disadvantaged, the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless” (Said 1994: 84). In the specific case of critical security studies, this means placing the experience of those men and women and communities for whom the present world order is a cause of insecurity rather than security at the center of the agenda and making suffering humanity rather than raison d’état the prism through which problems are viewed. Here the project stands full–square within the critical theory tradition. If “all theory is for someone and for some purpose,” then critical security studies is for “the voiceless, the unrepresented, the powerless,” and its purpose is their emancipation. The theoretical implications of this orientation have already been discussed in the previous chapters. They involve a fundamental reconceptualization of security with a shift in referent object and a broadening of the range of issues considered as a legitimate part of the discourse. They also involve a reconceptualization of strategy within this expanded notion of security. But the question remains at the conceptual level of how these alternative types of theorizing—even if they are self–consciously aligned to the practices of critical or new social movements, such as peace activism, the struggle for human rights, and the survival of minority cultures—can become “a force for the direction of action.” Again, Gramsci’s work is insightful. In the Prison Notebooks, Gramsci advances a sophisticated analysis of how dominant discourses play a vital role in upholding particular political and economic orders, or, in Gramsci’s terminology, “historic blocs” (Gramsci 1971: 323–377). Gramsci adopted Machiavelli’s view of power as a centaur, half man, half beast: a mixture of consent and coercion. Consent is produced and reproduced by a ruling hegemony that holds sway through civil society and through which ruling or dominant ideas become widely dispersed. 2 In particular, Gramsci describes how ideology becomes sedimented in society and takes on the status of common sense; it becomes subconsciously accepted and even regarded as beyond question. Obviously, for Gramsci, there is nothing immutable about the values that permeate society; they can and do change**.** In the social realm, ideas and institutions that were once seen as natural and beyond question (i.e., commonsensical) in the West, such as feudalism and slavery, are now seen as anachronistic, unjust, and unacceptable. In Marx’s well–worn phrase, “All that is solid melts into the air.” Gramsci’s intention is to harness this potential for change and ensure that it moves in the direction of emancipation. To do this he suggests a strategy of a “war of position” (Gramsci 1971: 229–239). Gramsci argues that in states with developed civil societies, such as those in Western liberal democracies, any successful attempt at progressive social change requires a slow, incremental, even molecular, struggle to break down the prevailing hegemony and construct an alternative counterhegemony to take its place. Organic intellectuals have a crucial role to play in this process by helping to undermine the “natural,” “commonsense,” internalized nature of the status quo. This in turn helps create political space within which alternative conceptions of politics can be developed and new historic blocs created. I contend that Gramsci’s strategy of a war of position suggests an appropriate model for proponents of critical security studies to adopt in relating their theorizing to political practice. The Tasks of Critical Security Studies If the project of critical security studies is conceived in terms of a war of position, then the main task of those intellectuals who align themselves with the enterprise is to attempt to undermine the prevailing hegemonic security discourse. This may be accomplished by utilizing specialist information and expertise to engage in an immanent critique of the prevailing security regimes, that is, comparing the justifications of those regimes with actual outcomes. When this is attempted in the security field, the prevailing structures and regimes are found to fail grievously on their own terms. Such an approach also involves challenging the pronouncements of those intellectuals, traditional or organic, whose views serve to legitimate, and hence reproduce, the prevailing world order. This challenge entails teasing out the often subconscious and certainly unexamined assumptions that underlie their arguments while drawing attention to the normative viewpoints that are smuggled into mainstream thinking about security behind its positivist facade. In this sense, proponents of critical security studies approximate to Foucault’s notion of “specific intellectuals” who use their expert knowledge to challenge the prevailing “regime of truth” (Foucault 1980: 132). However, critical theorists might wish to reformulate this sentiment along more familiar Quaker lines of “speaking truth to power” (this sentiment is also central to Said 1994) or even along the eisteddfod lines of speaking “truth against the world.” Of course, traditional strategists can, and indeed do, sometimes claim a similar role. Colin S. Gray, for example, states that “strategists must be prepared to ‘speak truth to power’” (Gray 1982a: 193). But the difference between Gray and proponents of critical security studies is that, whereas the former seeks to influence policymakers in particular directions without questioning the basis of their power, the latter aim at a thoroughgoing critique of all that traditional security studies has taken for granted. Furthermore, critical theorists base their critique on the presupposition, elegantly stated by Adorno, that “the need to lend suffering a voice is the precondition of all truth” (cited in Jameson 1990: 66). The aim of critical security studies in attempting to undermine the prevailing orthodoxy is ultimately educational. As Gramsci notes, “Every relationship of ‘hegemony’ is necessarily a pedagogic relationship” (Gramsci 1971: 350; see also the discussion of critical pedagogy in Neufeld 1995: 116–121). Thus, by criticizing the hegemonic discourse and advancing alternative conceptions of security based on different understandings of human potentialities, the approach is simultaneously playing a part in eroding the legitimacy of the ruling historic bloc and contributing to the development of a counterhegemonic position. There are a number of avenues open to critical security specialists in pursuing this educational strategy. As teachers, they can try to foster and encourage skepticism toward accepted wisdom and open minds to other possibilities. They can also take advantage of the seemingly unquenchable thirst of the media for instant punditry to forward alternative views onto a broader stage. Nancy Fraser argues: “As teachers, we try to foster an emergent pedagogical counterculture.... As critical public intellectuals we try to inject our perspectives into whatever cultural or political public spheres we have access to” (Fraser 1989: 11). Perhaps significantly, support for this type of emancipatory strategy can even be found in the work of the ultrapessimistic Adorno, who argues: In the history of civilization there have been not a few instances when delusions were healed not by focused propaganda, but, in the final analysis, because scholars, with their unobtrusive yet insistent work habits, studied what lay at the root of the delusion. (cited in Kellner 1992: vii) Such “unobtrusive yet insistent work” does not in itself create the social change to which Adorno alludes. The conceptual and the practical dangers of collapsing practice into theory must be guarded against. Rather, through their educational activities, proponents of critical security studies should aim to provide support for those social movements that promote emancipatory social change. By providing a critique of the prevailing order and legitimating alternative views, critical theorists can perform a valuable role in supporting the struggles of social movements. That said, the role of theorists is not to direct and instruct those movements with which they are aligned; instead, the relationship is reciprocal. The experience of the European, North American, and Antipodean peace movements of the 1980s shows how influential social movements can become when their efforts are harnessed to the intellectual and educational activity of critical thinkers. For example, in his account of New Zealand’s antinuclear stance in the 1980s, Michael C. Pugh cites the importance of the visits of critical intellectuals such as Helen Caldicott and Richard Falk in changing the country’s political climate and encouraging the growth of the antinuclear movement (Pugh 1989: 108; see also Cortright 1993: 5–13). In the 1980s peace movements and critical intellectuals interested in issues of security and strategy drew strength and succor from each other’s efforts. If such critical social movements do not exist, then this creates obvious difficulties for the critical theorist. But even under these circumstances, the theorist need not abandon all hope of an eventual orientation toward practice. Once again, the peace movement of the 1980s provides evidence of the possibilities. At that time, the movement benefited from the intellectual work undertaken in the lean years of the peace movement in the late 1970s. Some of the theories and concepts developed then, such as common security and nonoffensive defense, were eventually taken up even in the Kremlin and played a significant role in defusing the second Cold War. Those ideas developed in the 1970s can be seen in Adornian terms of a “message in a bottle,” but in this case, contra Adorno’s expectations, they were picked up and used to support a program of emancipatory political practice. Obviously, one would be naive to understate the difficulties facing those attempting to develop alternative critical approaches within academia. Some of these problems have been alluded to already and involve the structural constraints of academic life itself. Said argues that many problems are caused by what he describes as the growing “professionalisation” of academic life (Said 1994: 49–62). Academics are now so constrained by the requirements of job security and marketability that they are extremely risk–averse. It pays—in all senses—to stick with the crowd and avoid the exposed limb by following the prevalent disciplinary preoccupations, publish in certain prescribed journals, and so on. The result is the navel gazing so prevalent in the study of international relations and the seeming inability of security specialists to deal with the changes brought about by the end of the Cold War (Kristensen 1997 highlights the search of U.S. nuclear planners for “new targets for old weapons”). And, of course, the pressures for conformism are heightened in the field of security studies when governments have a very real interest in marginalizing dissent. Nevertheless, opportunities for critical thinking do exist, and this thinking can connect with the practices of social movements and become a “force for the direction of action.” The experience of the 1980s, when, in the depths of the second Cold War, critical thinkers risked demonization and in some countries far worse in order to challenge received wisdom, thus arguably playing a crucial role in the very survival of the human race, should act as both an inspiration and a challenge to critical security studies.

### Turns Case---Commodification

#### This leads to the commoditization of movements and turns case.

Fabricant 13 [Fabricant, Nicole. "Good living for whom? Bolivia’s climate justice movement and the limitations of indigenous cosmovisions." Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies 8.2 (2013): 159-178] AJ

In conclusion, there are several problems with the new use and mobility of essentialized indigenous constructs as a solution to climate change. An over-reliance or focus on indigenous ways and customs as detached from political and economic realities can prove dangerous. Ideas like Buen Vivir (as they travel from concrete ethno-territorial projects to globalized discourses) can be easily picked up by distinct groups, commoditized, and refashioned to advance corporate/rightist agendas. On one hand, rural indigenous organizers commoditize this idea of the egalitarian ayllu where indigenous peoples protect and preserve the natural environmnent. On the other hand, agribusiness elites have had to claim an indigenous identity (linking themselves to lowland indigenous groups through spectacular performances) in order to stake claims to the lowland region and to critical resources in the region (Fabricant, 2009; Fabricant & Postero, 2013). So why shouldn’t we be wary of indigeneity as a free-floating construct or signifier? Who gets to claim rights to the indigenous? How and in what ways do these essentialized constructs limit the possibility for the real critical work that needs to be done on climate change: bridging of urban and rural space, indigenous and mestizo concerns, reflections upon consumption and extractive models of development from all angles.

## Links

### 2N Link Defense Link

#### All their link defense is a new link – their attempt to sanitize their representations makes them more dangerous

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

We shall see how this is done through several examples in the following. We will base ourselves on Walt Disney’s Pocahontas, and a pro-environmental advertising starring actor Indian Iron Eyes Cody. The stereotype of the Indian living in harmony with Nature is a predominant one within Western representations of Native Americans (Lewis and Clark). This is the case of the Disney motion picture Pocahontas. This will be the film of reference in relation to analyzing the romanticized Native American. We are aware that Disney's Pocahontas is addressed first and foremost to children, which could in part account for this simplified view of Native Americans. In the first scene, we are presented to the Indians canoeing back to their tribe. The women are picking corn for the gathering, men are hunting fish with spears, some children are playing together while others are watching a 'shaman’' making animal shapes in the fire. These activities are undertaken with a smile whilst they are chanting a song in colorful surroundings (Ebert, 1995). The underlying discourse concerning Native Americans as living in harmony with Nature is innocence. This is observable in relation to the passage a above. Representing Native Americans in a way which limits their lived situations to living peacefully in harmony with Nature depicts this. As stated in the chapter concerning stereotypes, the power of the stereotype takes place when it is unnoticed. At first sight, what seems less innocent than a portrayal of Indians living peacefully in touch with Nature? Innocence here is a strong discourse as it does not seem to hold any underlying threats, appearing transparent. The irony is that the more it appears to be innocent, the more power it holds. This way Disney is able to present their own depiction of Native Americans neglecting lived experiences, history and political contexts of Native Americans. This permits them to rewrite their own history. Due to the symbolic power of stereotypes, viewers will take these representations as being the truth. Their life does not appear to us as engaging in struggles, where the atmosphere is very peaceful and calm. This somewhat trivializes their customs and way of life, as it is not a complete representation of their culture, undermining aspects such as spirituality or communality to an innocent portrayal which . These are core aspects of Native American culture (Erwin: 2-3). There is a major source of power in their hands, as they can 'manipulate' happenings and portray them as they wish to due to the control over factual events and underlying discourses. Indeed, the story of Pocahontas as presented by Disney is not representative of the historical facts, but facts as mediated (detolddisney.wordpress).

#### Their portrayal of indigenous populations’ life as universally being one of harmony with nature oversimplifies and essentializes their culture

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

We shall see how this is done through several examples in the following. We will base ourselves on Walt Disney’s Pocahontas, and a pro-environmental advertising starring actor Indian Iron Eyes Cody. The stereotype of the Indian living in harmony with Nature is a predominant one within Western representations of Native Americans (Lewis and Clark). This is the case of the Disney motion picture Pocahontas. This will be the film of reference in relation to analyzing the romanticized Native American. We are aware that Disney's Pocahontas is addressed first and foremost to children, which could in part account for this simplified view of Native Americans. In the first scene, we are presented to the Indians canoeing back to their tribe. The women are picking corn for the gathering, men are hunting fish with spears, some children are playing together while others are watching a 'shaman’' making animal shapes in the fire. These activities are undertaken with a smile whilst they are chanting a song in colorful surroundings (Ebert, 1995). The underlying discourse concerning Native Americans as living in harmony with Nature is innocence. This is observable in relation to the passage a above. Representing Native Americans in a way which limits their lived situations to living peacefully in harmony with Nature depicts this. As stated in the chapter concerning stereotypes, the power of the stereotype takes place when it is unnoticed. At first sight, what seems less innocent than a portrayal of Indians living peacefully in touch with Nature? Innocence here is a strong discourse as it does not seem to hold any underlying threats, appearing transparent. The irony is that the more it appears to be innocent, the more power it holds. This way Disney is able to present their own depiction of Native Americans neglecting lived experiences, history and political contexts of Native Americans. This permits them to rewrite their own history. Due to the symbolic power of stereotypes, viewers will take these representations as being the truth. Their life does not appear to us as engaging in struggles, where the atmosphere is very peaceful and calm. This somewhat trivializes their customs and way of life, as it is not a complete representation of their culture, undermining aspects such as spirituality or communality to an innocent portrayal which . These are core aspects of Native American culture (Erwin: 2-3). There is a major source of power in their hands, as they can 'manipulate' happenings and portray them as they wish to due to the control over factual events and underlying discourses. Indeed, the story of Pocahontas as presented by Disney is not representative of the historical facts, but facts as mediated (detolddisney.wordpress).

#### This is meant to render indigenous culture as primitive and inoffensive, which essentializes and justifies exclusion and mass violence

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

Additionally, as mentioned earlier, a stereotype is usually made when the Other is perceived as a threat. According to Hall, infantilization is a key method used in this case, emphasizing the menace. Here, we have a clear discourse of innocence which can directly be linked to this infantilization process where the Indian is rendered inoffensive. This might be due to the fact that “hybridity” was perceived as the worst alienation, the colonizers thereby fearing the natives as a threat to their integral culture. The fact that the tribes were placed in reservations and not integrated within the settler society strongly reinforces this. It might not be the case that there is still this fear of ‘racial degeneration’ today, however, as stated earlier, imperialist discourses are still present in our modern society. There is another important aspect involved in representing Native Americans as living peacefully and innocently with Nature which involves symbolic control over the 'other'. In films, it is easy to note contrasts between the Natives and settlers (as these films often take place during the discovery of the New World). This can be observed in the 'primitiveness' of the Natives and the 'modernism' and 'development' of the Settlers. In Pocahontas, The settlers appear with their ships, guns, metal armor and other items representative of the modernized world. In contrast the Indians are represented as wearing animal clothing, fighting with spears and archery and believing in 'magic'. This lack of technology on the Natives' side clearly explicates that they are inferior to the settlers as they are in no way a threat to them. Indeed, if desired they can be killed at any time.

#### It also results in radical exclusion and domination of indigenous people

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

In the chapter concerning stereotypes, we have elicited how primitives are denied history as they are refused a place on the scale which divides time according to stages of progress. As we have observed, Indians have often been depicted as living in conditions which are contrary to progress. They are thus denied time. This is a symbolic exclusion. Due to not having a past or history, they are 'fixed' in a stagnating notion of time. It does not leave them the possibility for change. They are left symbolically excluded from our globalized society with no chances of belonging to it. The stereotype is therefore serving the function of symbolically excluding the 'Other' and maintaining him excluded

### Link – Using Indigenous Knowledge

#### They use indigenous culture as a tool to access environmental gains – this makes them subservient to Western populations and devalues their culture – it also results in assimilation which destroys their culture

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow at Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute] AT

By representing Native Americans as living peacefully with Nature, they are happily assimilated into our culture to fit our needs. This can can be noted in the commercial concerning the environment starring Iron Eyes Cody where the slogan is: ”Get involved now, pollution hurts all of us” (Adcouncil). This advertisement was first aired on television in 1971 and features Iron Eyes Cody, an actor thought to have been Native American until it was later discovered that he was of italian descent. What is important here is that Native Americans have been happily assimilated as a spectacle in order to fit the West's needs. This shows an essentialist view where the natives are molded in order to fit our standards, perceived as the universal truth towards which all ought to strive. In a time of climate change, it is of perfect use to bring out the 'natural Indian'. The Indian is not only inoffensive, but even contributing to helping the Western world and the problems it has brought up. We can say that cultural imperialism has succeeded by making Native Americans into 'docile pets', useful only in fulfilling the West's fantasies and needs by maintaining them in this 'primitive' state. In the chapter concerning stereotypes, we have elicited how primitives are denied history as they are refused a place on the scale which divides time according to stages of progress. As we have observed, Indians have often been depicted as living in conditions which are contrary to progress. They are thus denied time. This is a symbolic exclusion. Due to not having a past or history, they are 'fixed' in a stagnating notion of time. It does not leave them the possibility for change. They are left symbolically excluded from our globalized society with no chances of belonging to it. The stereotype is therefore serving the function of symbolically excluding the 'Other' and maintaining him excluded Representations of the wise or shamanistic Indians have been apparent in several films such as in The Doors or The Simpsons Movie. In the two first examples, this character personifies the mystical and spiritual aspect of Native American culture. In Oliver Stone's The Doors, the image of an old Indian appears several in times of need for Jim Morrison, as an advisor (Nittle). Similarly, in The Simpsons movie a woman gives Homer some ”fire water” to help him regain consciousness and shows him his path. In both cases, the mystical and wise Indian serves to help lead the main character back to the right path. Again, we see how imperialism has succeeded as the Indians are benevolently using their traditional methods to 'serve the colonizer'. These characters have no individual autonomy, but their value comes as complementary to how they guide the white character.

### Link – Dying Race

#### The idea that indigenous populations are a dying culture reinforces ideas of racial purity and excludes these cultures from dominant society
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The thought that Native Americans are a dying race is one which is widely spread. Two films involving Native Americans can be related to this notion: ‘The Last of Mohicans’ and ‘Last of Dogmen’. These two films belong to the top three rated films involving Native Americans on IMDB. The former film tells the story is about the dying tribe the “Mohicans” in which only two are left as well as one adopted white man, and in the latter one of the main characters ”...Gates ventures further into the mountains and discovers an isolated settlement inhabited by a Native American tribe thought to have been wiped out by white settlers a century earlier.” (IMDB). Both show an interest for the notion of depicting Native Americans as a dying race such as in these films. It points to the fact that they are believed to be on the verge of extinction. This idea was also spread regarding Native American art, as mentioned earlier in the project. Indeed, Native American art was seen as vanishing and attempted to be 'preserved'. This supposes that races are inherent and natural. Therefore a mixing of races will lead to an 'unpure' or different race, which would account to why Native Americans are a 'dying race'. According to this essentialist thought, due to the fact that currently Native Americans have somewhat been assimilated to American culture, they are not considered as natives anymore. What is problematic with this thought is that it does not consider the cultural arbitrariness of these cultural constructs but instead sees these as innate. It takes these social constructs as being natural. It is when cultural arbitrariness is taken as true that we refer to the concept of ‘myth’. We have here a situation similar to the symbolic power involved in stereotypes, as when it takes on a natural appearance it becomes a strong source of symbolic control. Indeed, as the dominant groups control and shape representations, they will do this to their advantage in a way which excludes the 'Other', in this case the 'Dying Race'. However, as mentioned earlier, this fear of the dying race is far from reality, as the native population is in fact increasing over time. The Indian as authentic portrays an Indian which is in the past. If the Native American wishes to be integrated within Western culture, he will lose his status as 'Indian' according to this discourse. He is then symbolically forced to belong to the past. Furthermore, the 'authentic' Native American which is in the past does not belong in our developed and globalized society. According to the scale of time determined by modernity and progress, the 'authentic is denied time (as was the primitive). Indeed, he does not correspond to the characteristics of civilization as he continues living in a natural or ‘primitive’ environment on reservations. There is therefore a double expulsion maintaining him in the past. Depicting Native Americans as a Dying Race is a way of maintaining symbolic control over them. Social Darwinism could account to why Native Americans are a dying race in relation to the survival of the fittest. Native Americans would be considered a weaker culture as they have not succeeded in surviving. According to this thought, they endangered and near extinction. They are therefore inferior and dominated by the U.S.A. This places them in a victimized position and therefore legitimizes the right of the West to be their ‘saviors’. Indeed, their intervention is even ‘necessary’ because if they are a dying race, they cannot survive on their own. A power relation is visible here between the ‘savior’ and the ‘victim’, where the savior is clearly in a dominant position, his actions even gratified and honorable. In this way, the actions of the United States can be supported. As an example, the placing of Native Americans in reservations may attempt to preserve their culture by ensuring that they have their own territory but this further excludes them. Indeed, by living in reservations, Native Americans are marginalized and physically excluded from the society. The myth of the 'Dying Race' can be related to that of 'authenticity'. Indeed, both stem from essentialist beliefs that there are 'innate' social categories which exist exterior from social constructs of a culture leads to specific ways of representing, which are very common in the portrayal of the natives. It is not a coincidence that many adaptations are set a few centuries back to when the natives were still considered authentic. Related to the Indian as a dying race, there have been stereotypes about the Indian as being 'stoic' (Nittle). This is represented in various films or in Curtis' photographs, where almost none of the subjects figured on the portraits smile. Curtis was a photographer of the early twentieth century and has portrayed many monochromatic Native Americans portraits. These images are iconic as they are the representations concerning Native Americans which we are most exposed to (nativeappropriations). In Curtis' opinion, the Indian was a dying race and this was illustrated through his work. These images are in fact not representative of Native Americans. The Hopi tribe, as an example, view that we are all clowns in life and that we have to clown our way through life (Harlan et al: 211). This exemplifies the Western interest in the Native American without attempting to truly understand these cultures as they are but rather as one wishes to see in them. According to essentialism, there are essentially inherent or true cultures. Because of this, a culture is real when it is not mixed. There is thus an idea that a Native American is true when he is living as he was before having been exposed to the western culture. If there are ‘true’ Native Americans then there can be ‘false’ ones. This can be noted in the fact that Native Americans are considered real only when recognizable through objects such as feathers, tipis or smoking pipes. When we think of a Native American, we reduce their culture to these few icons. However, these icons do not reveal the complexity of various Native American tribes but are reductionist. They are so to the extent that if a Native American is seen without these attributes, he will not be identified as being a Native American. These stereotypes have become necessary to defining what is Indian. There is a metonymization of the Indian where a part defines the whole. This is also an objectification of the Native American, as he exists only as complementary to these objects. He is not subject but has become object. There has been the use of the term ‘Indian’ to refer to all Native Americans and therefore reducing them to one common group. As has been observed previously in the project, there are many Native American groups so this is not a valid claim. Native Americans have often been reduced in their representation as to being one culture. As we have seen earlier in the project, ‘authenticity’ was a Western established concept to portray what the West was interested in representing and defining the Native as. This was the case with the Indian Art Market. The West therefore controls authenticity and does not leave Native Americans the space to define themselves. The same case occurred with aboriginal peoples of Australia: “subaltern speech are contained by the discourse of the oppressor, and in which the writing of the Australian Aboriginal under the sign of ‘authenticity’ is an act of ‘liberal’ discursive violence” (Bill Ashcroft: 238). ‘Authenticity’ works as an act of liberal discursive violence as it does not allow the Natives to define themselves and mutes them on a symbolic level.

#### Framing government as the solution is also a link

Minssieux 13 [(Nelly Minssieux, Milene Minssieux and Kristoffer Sidenius) “The Impact of Essentialist Representations on the Native American in a Postcolonial Context” Project Report – Cultural Encounters, Fall 2013 – Supervisor: Prem Poddar, Senior Fellow, Zentrum Moderner Orient cultural and historical research institute ] AT

Depicting Native Americans as a Dying Race is a way of maintaining symbolic control over them. Social Darwinism could account to why Native Americans are a dying race in relation to the survival of the fittest. Native Americans would be considered a weaker culture as they have not succeeded in surviving. According to this thought, they endangered and near extinction. They are therefore inferior and dominated by the U.S.A. This places them in a victimized position and therefore legitimizes the right of the West to be their ‘saviors’. Indeed, their intervention is even ‘necessary’ because if they are a dying race, they cannot survive on their own. A power relation is visible here between the ‘savior’ and the ‘victim’, where the savior is clearly in a dominant position, his actions even gratified and honorable. In this way, the actions of the United States can be supported. As an example, the placing of Native Americans in reservations may attempt to preserve their culture by ensuring that they have their own territory but this further excludes them. Indeed, by living in reservations, Native Americans are marginalized and physically excluded from the society. The myth of the 'Dying Race' can be related to that of 'authenticity'. Indeed, both stem from essentialist beliefs that there are 'innate' social categories which exist exterior from social constructs of a culture leads to specific ways of representing, which are very common in the portrayal of the natives. It is not a coincidence that many adaptations are set a few centuries back to when the natives were still considered authentic.

## Frontlines/Extensions

### A2 My Essentialism Is True

#### Essentialism is socially constructed

Gelman 12 [(Susan, professor of psychology at the University of Michigan, won the Eleanor Maccoby Book Prize from Division 7 of the American Psychological Association) “An interview with... Susan Gelman on Essentialism” Fivebooks Dec 12] AT

People have all kinds of cognitive biases, ways that we look at the world that are not quite in tune with reality, shortcuts that we use to make sense of the world. Essentialism is one of those and seems to be really pervasive. It’s how we think about everyday categories around us, like women or dogs or gold, or social categories, like different races or ethnicities. We tend to think that if we have a word for these categories, that it’s real and based in nature, that it’s not constructed by humans, but is really out there. We think that it has some deep, underlying basis and that if we look hard enough, we’ll be able to learn something about that deep underlying something that all members of the category have in common. That’s why it’s called essentialism, because that underlying something, that makes a Jew a member of that category, for example, is the essence. People have looked at this in different cultures. In modern educated American culture people often think, “Oh, genes or DNA, that’s the essence that all members of a category share.” But if you go to cultures where they don’t have that scientific understanding, they still think there is something there that all members of the category share. Are you saying that there isn’t anything there? That it’s just a cognitive bias? If you ask biologists, they would say, “No, there is not any one thing that’s inherent in each individual member of a category.” Let’s jump right into race, which is one of the most contested areas. An essentialist would say that there is a sharp divide between white and black. That all members of the category of white people have something in common in their DNA, where you could identify absolutely – yes or no – if they’re a member of that category, what’s different from people who are black, and that that has all kinds of deep consequences for behaviour, personality, et cetera. A biologist would say, no. For one thing, it’s all about variation. There is no one thing that all white people have in common. There’s all this variability in DNA at the individual level, and the differences between people of so-called different races are predictive of appearance, of skin colour, and whatever other superficial differences we use to distinguish races. They actually are not predictive of anything else. You get nearly as much variability in genetic material in one community in Africa, as you get across the world. There is no evidence that genes that predict outward physical differences are deeply determining of any other traits. So that is one thing. Another thing is that even if you actually take a species, like different kinds of birds, for example – from a biologist’s perspective they are actually defined in terms of inter-breeding populations. There’s nothing at the level of the individual organism that can tell you absolutely that all and only members of this category have precisely the same genetic material. We want to place individuals in categories and say, at some level they’re all the same, in this deep way. But just the way you get variability on the surface, you get variability all the way through.